



Fund

Fund Council

6th Meeting (FC6)—Rome, Italy

November 8-9, 2011

IWMI responses to IDRC comments

(Working Document - For Discussion Only)

*Document presented for Agenda Item 7:
CRP 5 Proposal*

Submitted by:
IWMI

Response from IWMI to IDRC comments on CRP5

- Climate change considerations are taken into account in some sections of the proposal but not across. Given that changes in precipitation and temperature are inevitable over the coming decades, more emphasis would be needed to ensure that planned interventions (i.e new irrigations systems) are designed to accommodate new climatic extremes.

We aim to link strongly to CRP7 on climate change issues. It will be one of the key drivers of change, but it will be variable in its impact in terms of geography. For example in the Indus Basin there are expected to be major impacts, but in the Eastern Himalayan basins, the impact on water availability is much less clear. We will of course be considering the relative importance of all external drivers as we further define problem sets and projects. We also consider that in the medium term climate variability and seasonality may be equally important drivers that we have to contend with in our projects.

- The research builds on previous research in a meaningful way. In general there are not new themes in the program but more a regrouping of issues that the CG has been working with for some time. They have elaborated a conceptual framework to support the need to interlace agriculture with the environment.

No comment other than it is important for the CG to start to embrace natural resource management in an interactive manner which this CRP is trying to do.

- Working at a basin level follows from recommendations from various previous CGIAR programs.

No comment

- Objectives are well defined. Some of may be overly ambitious.

We intend to ensure that we focus on critical objectives in a staged manner (see final comment as well).

- It is positive that the program has identified specific outcomes that intent to achieve by 2020. They will facilitate the monitoring and accountability but some of them are not easily achievable. In particular balancing the production of more food with preserving the function of ecosystems is not going to be an easy task.

The key outcomes are those defined in the problem sets which are still to be further elaborated during the inception phase. The 2020 outcomes in the introduction were intended as possible exemplars of what can be achieved.

- The SRP on reuse of water is somehow new to the CG and is one where progress could be achieved rapidly. More resources could be directed towards that component as well as to research on restoration of degraded lands.

This is a growing area and we would expect the Steering Committee to consider resource allocation as it develops. At present we are building staff numbers and could not handle a major rapid expansion.

- The program will try to include gender as a crosscutting issue in the research agenda. A gender leader and other staff will be hired to ensure that gender is taken into account so likely this will be properly addressed.

No comment

- The monitoring and evaluation plan is difficult to judge at this stage. The use of reasonably well detailed log frames will facilitate the monitoring of progress during the life cycle of the program. The evaluation strategy will need more refinement but the team has already indicated provisions for that.

No comment

- The program still looks like five different programs named under a single umbrella. Integration of the separate components will be a major challenge.

We have tried to ensure that this is not the case. We will demonstrate in the FC meeting the interrelated nature of the themes and will continue to work towards greater cross cutting integration. One key issue is to demonstrate that poorly performing soils can be improved by better water management and supplementary irrigation and judicious use of recovered wastes, while at the same time ensuring that ecosystem services are improved and/or maintained. Similarly with major irrigation development we have to consider how this can be achieved without environmental externalities and how we can grow more with less water.

- In general terms the budget seems adequate for a program of this length, geographical and thematic spectrum. However, the budget for the initial year appears a bit high given that there would be numerous coordination activities in year one and likely not much field research being initiated in that period.

We strongly disagree. We have based the budget on 2010 funds plus inflation adjustment. They have to cover the activities that are transitioning to the CRP and also all the CPWF original core funding. If year one funding is decreased the major center partners would have to lay off some key staff. The money requested for key programmatic activities is to ensure that we can appoint a high caliber core team of staff to run the program, fund inception workshops, regional coordination, partner engagement and other vital functions.

- The proponents made a good effort to try to address comments provided by the council to the initial document. Our perception is still that the program is overly ambitious and is in

reality a collection of disparate programs rather than a coordinated effort. There is, however, potential in the overall goal of minimizing the environmental footprint of agriculture on the environment. Contributions towards that goal could be achieved and will be innovative especially if the team identifies at least one basin where success could be verified.

Our intention is to establish ex ante baselines and benchmarks at problem set level to ensure that we can monitor change in yields, livelihoods and ecosystem services/environmental functions. We stress that we are not intending to do everything in all basins, but tailor the objectives to the capabilities of the partnerships under development. This will be made very clear in our annual and project work plans so that expectations and outcomes can be readily understood and assessed. In the Ganges, for example, our focus will be very much on how the eastern Indian Ganges water machine can help poor farmers increase livelihoods whilst maintaining critical ecosystem and services. In the Mekong the focus will be on the water, food, energy, and environment nexus. In East Africa and the Nile on rainfed systems that can be enhanced by resource recovery and reuse, supplementary irrigation whilst maintaining catchment ecosystem services including water flows, water quality and biodiversity. Thus we are moderating our ambition, whilst at the same time moving towards integration.